

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 remain pending in the present application as amended. All claims have been rejected. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent and have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Examiner Liu is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on December 2, 2008. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. Cited art was discussed. No agreements were reached.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8, 9, 19, and 21-23 under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Tracey et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0083917), claims 10-16 and 18 under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over the Tracey reference in view of Evans et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0019560, and the remaining claims, all of which are dependent, under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over the Tracey, or Tracey and Evans, references in view of Brendle et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0021355). Applicants respectfully traverse the §§ 102 and 103 rejections insofar as they may be applied to the claims as amended. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references in general and the Tracey reference in particular do not disclose or even suggest matching the first and second service entities despite different first and second metadata attributes thereof, in the manner recited in the independent claims.

As was previously pointed out, the present application is generally directed to integrated management of different service entities in connection with respective different application services connected by a network, an example of which is shown in the application in connection with Fig. 5 thereof. While the service entities and application services may be most any respective entities and services, the application illustrates a scenario where a loan approval

computer system has a first application service that is a "credit history" component and a second service that is a "down payment" component. Thus, each application service may be considered to perform an overall function by way of a set of actions.

Each of the two application services may operate with respect to respective different data service entities, and the service entities may operate on similar data such as for example the name of an individual. As should be understood, then, each service entity of an application service may be considered to perform a particular one of the actions of the application service. However, the similar data for each service entity may be described by differing metadata attributes or data formats, such as for example a 'full name' as opposed to a 'first name' and a 'last name'. As should also be understood, the metadata attributes / formats for the data employed by each service entity represent the format of the corresponding data as the service entity expects to encounter the data.

To enable integrated management of service entities that operate on similar data but employ differing metadata attributes / data formats to describe the data, a context service matches the first and second service entities despite having the different metadata attributes. That is, the context service recognizes that despite the different metadata attributes, each service entity operates on the same data. Thus, an action that may be performed with regard to the one service entity, such as locating an individual based on a full name, can also be performed with regard to the other service entity, albeit by way of a first name and a last name.

As amended, each of independent claims 1, 10, and 19 recites that a first service entity is associated with a first application service, a second service entity is associated with a second application service different from the first application service, the first service entity of the first application service has first metadata attributes associated therewith, the second service entity of the second application service has second metadata attributes associated therewith, the first metadata attributes describes a format of data processed by the first service entity and the second metadata attributes describes a format of data processed by the second service entity, the first

metadata attributes of the first service entity are different from the second metadata attributes of the second service entity, and a context service matches the first and second service entities despite the different first and second metadata attributes thereof.

As was previously pointed out, the Tracey reference teaches a database system with bin records, each of which is the same exact table format, and thus based on the same metadata attributes. Applicants respectfully submit that the Tracey data in the bins table 200 of Fig. 3 is not exemplary of different metadata attributes in the manner now recited in independent claims 1, 10, and 19, especially inasmuch as all of the data in such bins table 200 is formatted according to a common data format / set of metadata attributes. That is, each record (i.e., a row in the table 200) includes an entry for a common set of attributes / data types as represented by the columns of the table 200. Instead, in the Tracey reference, each table of Fig. 3 represents a different set of metadata attributes. Nevertheless, the Tracey reference does not disclose or even suggest that a service entity of an application service corresponds to each table, and that each service entity is associated with a separate application service, and that a context service matches first and second service entities despite different first and second metadata attributes thereof and the service entities being associated with different application services, all as is now more positively recited in claims 1, 10, and 19.

The Examiner has argued that the bin items fields (e.g. 210 and 212) of Fig. 3 represent the different metadata [attributes] of the claims. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the fields are not the different metadata attributes as recited in the claims, especially inasmuch as each field does not “describe a format of data processed by [a corresponding] service entity” in the manner required by claims 1, 10, and 19. Moreover, the Examiner has argued that the Tracey scheduler corresponds to the service entity recited in the claims. However, such a scheduler if indeed a service entity cannot be both a first service entity and a second differing service entity, as is required by claims 1, 10, and 19.

The Examiner cites to the Evans reference with regard to claims 10-16 and 18 primarily as disclosing the use of an extensible markup language. Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully submit that the Evans reference like the Tracey reference also does not disclose or even suggest a context service that matches first and second service entities despite the different first and second metadata attributes thereof and different application services thereof as is now more positively recited in claims 1, 10, and 19. Moreover, none of the aforementioned references appreciates that by performing such matching it can be determined that an action is available to be performed based on a corresponding classification of the availability of the action for each of the matched first and second service entities, as is also now more positively recited in claims 1, 10, and 19.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Tracey reference does not disclose or even suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 1 and 19 as amended, and that the combination of the Tracey and Evans references does not disclose or even suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 10 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants must conclude that such references cannot be applied to anticipate or make obvious such claims 1, 10, and 19 as amended or any claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, and 21-23. Moreover, inasmuch as such independent claims are unanticipated and non-obvious, then so too must all claims depending therefrom including all other claims of the application be unanticipated and non-obvious, at least by their dependencies. As a result, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1949 / 301416.1
Application No.: 10/648,506
Office Action Dated: September 30, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application including claims 1-23 is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: December 22, 2008

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439